

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

MICHAEL MCMAHON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALTEC INDUSTRIES, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.: 3:10-cv-01305-PK

**OPINION AND ORDER ADOPTING
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Michael J. Ross
SLATER ROSS
720 SW Washington St., Ste. 750
Portland, OR 97205
Of Attorneys for Plaintiff

Emily Q. Shults
Mitchell J. Cogen
BULLARD SMITH JERNSTEDT WILSON
200 SW Market St., Ste. 1900
Portland, OR 97201
Of Attorneys for Defendant

SIMON, District Judge.

On March 26, 2012, Magistrate Judge Paul Papak filed Findings and Recommendations in this case. Dkt. 75. Judge Papak recommended that Defendant Altec Industries, Inc.'s motion for summary judgment, Dkt. 29, should be denied. No objections have been filed.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the court may "accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a

de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).


If, however, no objections are filed, the Magistrates Act does not prescribe any standard of review. In such cases, “[t]here is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Magistrates Act] intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (court must review *de novo* magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although in the absence of objections no review is required, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No objections having been made, the court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Papak’s findings and recommendations for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Papak’s Findings and Recommendation, Dkt. 75.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 7th day of May, 2012.



Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge